

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The Agitation of Thought is the Beginning of Truth.

VOL. 8.

NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY, 1854.

NO. 10.

S. R. KIRBY, M.D., EDITOR.

The Present Position of the two Schools of Medicine.

AN ADDRESS

Delivered in the Assembly Chamber, Albany, before
the Homœopathic Medical Society of the
State of New-York, at its
Annual Meeting,

FEBRUARY 14, 1854,

BY

ALONZO S. BALL, M.D., OF NEW-YORK CITY.

GENTLEMEN OF THE STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY:—The success of homœopathy, as a system of therapeutics, is no longer a problem. Already its modifying influence upon the entire profession is manifest; and we may with confidence predict that it will yet become the prevailing treatment of the sick. Most of us remember the time when we resolved to seek truth at any sacrifice, and to follow its indications, notwithstanding the sneers of our former colleagues, who either pitied us as fools or despised us as knaves. To us the system was then new; at first, a matter of experiment; next, of gradual conviction; then of triumphant demonstration; but at every step of the process it came into collision with a system matured by the growth of ages. With that system itself, with the habits it had formed, and the prejudices it had engendered in the community, we have had to wage an incessant conflict. But the result is no longer doubtful. We are assembled to-night, not to encourage each other's fainting hearts and to allay each other's fears, but to mingle our congratulations over the unparalleled success which has crowned our labors,—over a system now fully established in the public confidence, and commanding the respect even of its former enemies.

From this stand-point we deem it not unsuitable to the present occasion, to look over the field of contest, and take a brief survey of the present position and prospects of the two schools of medicine. I say the *two* schools, for at the present day but two

schools of medicine divide the confidence of the civilized world.

To the superficial observer, there is little to distinguish the disciple of either school in his public or private walks. Men of talent, of education, and of piety, are found in the ranks of both systems. Each system has its colleges, its hospitals, its dispensaries, and its journals of medicine. The professed aim of the practitioners of both schools, is to devise means of relief for suffering humanity in the shortest, safest, and most effectual manner. And yet, to the casual observer, it is obvious that there is no common bond of fellowship or interest between them; and not only no possibility of their consulting as to the best means of attaining the high end of their profession, but often a most uncharitable alienation of the old from the new.

To account for this fact, so strange at first sight, let us inquire still further:

We enter the colleges of the two systems; in each we find the several departments of chemistry, of anatomy, of physiology, of pathology, and of surgery, each affording equal facilities for the pursuit of these branches; each alike making proficiency in these imperative upon the student. We find also in each of them a chair of materia medica, and one of therapeutics; the former teaching the curative properties of drugs, and the latter the application of these drugs to the cure of disease—each school considering the diagnosis of disease and the pathological changes which occur in its progress equally indispensable.

Just here it is, however, that the line of similarity ends; here it is that the striking difference between the schools becomes manifest; because here, dismissing all the collateral sciences which occupy the position of auxiliaries, the great mission of the physician begins; and upon the question, How, and with what means shall the sick be cured, the two schools are and must ever be entirely antagonistic!

The old school of medicine, generally called allopathic, now stands in a new position before the world; and the intelligent and observing are beginning to understand this position. Heretofore, in the various changes which have marked its life, we

cannot say its progress—for we now strip it of its collateral branches, and speak of it only as a means of treatment of the sick—I say, that in all the changes which have thus far marked its life, the fact of the curative action of its remedies, and the orthodoxy of its principles, have hardly been questioned. The ignorant world has followed it through all its errors and absurdities, meekly suffering from its unnecessary inflictions, allowing the seeds of future disease to be freely sown by wholesale drugging, and dying even with resignation, if only this were sanctioned by its legitimate hand. Now and then, indeed, some reformer has had sufficient independence to condemn the school on the ground, that as a school its principles were so liable to abuse, from the difficulty of their safe application; and that, considering the immense number of those, who from inexperience, ignorance, or inability, were doing mischief to their patients, the world would have been quite as well off without a medical profession.

But, within a few years, a change has taken place as remarkable as it is fatal to the school; and there have crept into the community, at first doubts and queries as to the wholesale application of poisons to the cure of disease; and then, on the part of many, entire disbelief and open denial of the curative properties of drugs, until skepticism on this subject very generally prevails among candid and reflecting minds. Nor is this confined to the non-professional alone; very many among the professional ranks of the old school, men of mind and education—and more particularly among the younger portion of the school—have not hesitated to declare their want of faith in the possibility of ever assisting nature in recovery from disease by poisonous drugs, or by the application of those principles which have been the chief reliance of the old school for so many centuries.

The truth or falsity of the principles of the school, founded as they were upon hypothesis and theory, could only be established by a long series of experiments; but by reason of the limited application of its principles to *all* the phenomena of disease, and the necessarily depressing tendency of its treatment upon the vital powers, much was dependent on the cautious judgment of the practitioner; and the mal-practice and evil which often resulted, were ascribed to the *abuse* of the principles, and not to the falsity of the principles themselves. But this age is about to demonstrate to the world, by the experiments and confessions of the old school itself, that the fault lies mainly in its principles.

We shall endeavor to show, *first*, that in the present position of the old school lies the cause of the skepticism which threatens ultimately the destruction of the school, and the entire overthrow of the art

of healing as a science; and, *secondly*, that the only security against this result is in the establishment of a school founded upon a natural and universal law of cure.

Of the fact that there is in the community an increasing tendency to doubt the efficacy of all medical treatment there can be no dispute. For this the old school alone are responsible. It is the legitimate result of the want of confidence, which many of them are beginning to have in their own principles of cure,—arising from the discovery that those principles are false, and in their execution necessarily attended by more or less serious evils,—and of the actual abandonment of those plans of treatment which have been very generally pursued and considered indispensable in the severest forms of disease, for what is equivalent to no treatment and with vastly better results; by this course not only confessing that their former treatment was useless, but demonstrating the fact that it was positively injurious. In illustration of this, I beg leave to mention a remark recently made to me by an eminent member of the allopathic school. “I have so little confidence,” says he, “in my brethren, or rather so great ‘dread of their’ treatment, that whenever a patient of mine leaves me for the country, I always advise the employment of a homœopathic physician, in case of sickness, believing that my patient is safer in the hand of nature than in that of our science.” This cautious doctor is the representative of a class in the profession; a class which is daily augmenting, who are either resting contented with a simple dietetic plan of treatment, or, having lost all confidence in the only principles of the school, are taking refuge in an eclectic and empirical practice as a *dernier ressort*.

Every new allopathic journal affords evidence of this, and the fact is a striking comment on the condition of the school and the uncertainty of its principles. I shall have time to specify but a few of these remarkable changes which so fully illustrate the position we have assumed, and the negative character of the old-school reforms.

I need not remind my professional brethren, that severe inflammation of the lungs has been hitherto thought to demand the most heroic treatment at the hands of the old school; but, for the benefit of those who are ignorant of the principles of treatment which the old school have pursued in this disease, and lest others should think I might misrepresent the school, I beg leave to quote the words of Professor Wood of Philadelphia, who is one of the latest and best allopathic authorities in this country, who says, in speaking of this disease (vol. 2d, Wood’s Practice), “No disease will better bear the loss of blood than this. A full bleeding should be resorted to, followed by another and another, if the pain and inflammation still continue.

"When this course has been carried as far as is admissible, blood should be taken by cups and leeches to an extent corresponding to the strength of the patient." He concludes by saying, "Very frequently under this treatment (he should have said *even* under this treatment), the symptoms of the disease will subside, and the patient recover without further remedies; but when the disease proves obstinate, it may be proper to resort to a mercurial impression," that is, to keep the poor patient for days and weeks together, under the influence of that terrible poison, and entail upon his future life, should he recover, the horrible and incurable sufferings peculiar to the secondary effects of that drug. "Such is the course," says Dr. Wood, than whom there is no higher authority in the school, "such is the course that I have generally employed in this disease." He goes on to say, "other means have been highly recommended, and among them the use of tart. emetic in large doses. This plan," says Wood, "is not without its dangers. The depression may be too great, or gastrointestinal irritation be induced, and on the whole, it is less manageable than the lancet, and less safe than the mercurial plan." Such, you will please observe, is the authorized treatment of the old school, at the time of the publication of Wood's Practice, 1852; one or more of these remedies being considered indispensable to success in the treatment of this violent disease.

We will offer no comment upon this treatment, but quote the opinion of another member of the same school whose reputation is a sufficient guarantee to his opinion. Dr. Todd, F.R.S., physician to the King's College Hospital, thus speaks of the treatment of this disease, in his clinical lecture number eight, "In all cases of pneumonia (or inflammation of the lungs) there is, independent of any treatment, a decided tendency to a depression of the powers of life, in some cases more and in others less, and that in *all* cases a decidedly antiphlogistic treatment is hazardous, with some extremely so, and in none is it absolutely necessary." You will observe that here are two gentlemen of high standing in the same school, recommending treatment diametrically opposite in the same disease. They cannot both be right. If Dr. Todd, with his new plan of *no* treatment, be successful, then we cannot escape the conclusion that Dr. Wood and his numerous followers have long been, and are still, doing immense evil by the destructive means which their principles compel them to adopt. Dr. Todd's acquaintance with pneumonia we cannot doubt; but that his language might not be misunderstood, he goes on in his article before us to report two cases of pleuro-pneumonia, of an average amount of severity, one patient being a strong, plethoric, athletic porter, just such a one as Dr. Todd remarks, "You

might bleed without hesitation; the other, although not so vigorous, neither his constitution nor the symptoms would have justified our regarding it as asthenic." Yet he carried these cases through to complete convalescence, without taking a drop of blood or administering a grain of mercury or tart. emetic, showing conclusively that neither of these ordinary methods of cure are necessary, and, if not, they are of course destructive to the powers of life, inasmuch as they are violent agencies. So simple was the treatment he did adopt, that he says, "I am quite prepared to hear it objected that such a treatment is really doing nothing but leaving the disease to take its own course;" and, he nobly adds, "Very well, if that course be to recovery in so short a time, and at no expense to the powers of the patient, can we adopt any plan better suited to him." Allow me to quote a little further from the doctor: "The plan of treatment which has been recommended by some of our highest authorities (he should have said, which has been universally practised in the school), I need not tell you, is that by bleeding and tart. emetic." "I have had ample experience in this treatment," adds Dr. Todd, "and I must confess that that experience has so little satisfied me with it, that I have for some years ceased to adopt it; for under this treatment I have seen too many die, and when recovery has taken place, in too many instances it has been a tedious, lengthened convalescence. Indeed of all the fatal cases it has fallen to my lot to witness, the great majority of them have been treated in this way, and in most of them the antiphlogistic treatment has not been carried to an excessive or unwarrantable extent."

He further remarks in regard to the tart. emetic treatment, "I have long noticed that patients do best when the drug neither sickens nor produces catharsis, and on this subject I am glad to fortify my own opinion, formed independently, by those of two such excellent authorities as Dr. Thos. Davies and Dr. Watson, who says,—and this is in accordance with my own experience,—that tart. emetic always acts the best when it produces no effect except upon the inflammation, and causes no depression of the vital powers." What a beautiful illustration of its specific action, I need not remind those who are in the habit of prescribing it in this disease, and in just such doses as produce the effect described by Dr. Todd. Homœopaths can appreciate this collateral testimony to the truth of their doctrine, coming from the old school. But among our own countrymen we find very many of our best physicians and surgeons gradually abandoning the sheet anchors of the old school, for a treatment but little besides good nursing. In Prof. Bartlett's treatise on fevers, we find the

following confession in regard to the treatment of fever: "There are few diseases," says he, "of equal frequency and importance, the treatment of which is more unsettled than that of typhoid fever. Opposite modes of management have been adopted by different practitioners, and although experiments have been conducted on a large scale, and under circumstances favorable to the discovery of truth, yet they have not resulted in the establishment of any uniform and satisfactory method of treatment; and there is no unanimity in the opinions and conduct of the different practitioners." He then goes on to mention Dr. Jackson's mode of treatment, then that of Dr. Nathan Smith, who says that "active interference in this disease will do more harm than good;" then Chomel's, Louis', Bouillard's, and De Larroque's method, all differing, and sometimes recommending treatment quite opposite. Prof. Bartlett concludes his remarks by saying that it is both interesting and gratifying to see the good sense and sound judgment of the continental practitioners in the management of this disease; Burserius says, after having given a most excellent description of the fever, "a simple plan of cure, if it is to be recommended in any case, is certainly to be adopted in the present; the less the operations of nature are disturbed by art, the milder and safer the remedies we employ, the more successfully do we restore the patient's health; and again, the poor people, content with patience and proper attention to the regulation of the diet, despising all kinds of drugs, recover more certainly."

But, in farther illustration of this want of confidence in their own principles, allow me to cite a case which occurred in my own practice in the city of New-York, where I was accidentally thrown into the treatment of a case of pneumonia while the patient was under the care of an eminent allopathic physician and surgeon. The circumstances were these. A young gentleman in robust health, falling through a hatchway, fractured his leg and arm, which were set by the surgeon. On the third day of the accident, while everything was doing well, as to the fractures, we found him in the following state; pulse full and hard, 110 per minute; face flushed; pain in the head, with delirium; breathing with much difficulty; and crepitation audible in both lungs.

The case looked alarming, and I deemed it advisable to inform the surgeon of his condition. After an examination of the patient, he gave it as his opinion that one, if not both of his lungs, was suffering from pneumonia (taken from his exposure upon the floor and his water dressings), and that the chances of recovery were very much against him. Upon questioning him as to the course of treatment he would recom-

mend, he replied, "I would do nothing; nature does much for these cases." In three or four days, under Acon. Bry. and Phos., all traces of the inflammation had disappeared. Now, if blood-letting was ever applicable (to say nothing of its being indispensable), this was a case and a time which demanded it; yet the surgeon was either false to the principles of his school, or the school have no fixed principle on which to rely.

But the change which marks this age, and which will become yet more striking before many years shall have elapsed, is no more impressive than that which occurred thirty years ago in the treatment of consumption. Once this was treated, and that within the lifetime of some who hear me, as heroically as pneumonia is now; but cod-liver oil, roast beef, and porter, have taken the place of blood-letting, blistering, and leeching. Other diseases there are, which, in a still more striking manner, exhibit the abuse of specifics by the old school—diseases in which mercury has been used unsparingly by the profession—and one* in particular, (Syphilis,) in the treat-

* The following remarks, as quoted from No. 8 of Prof. Bennett's valuable Clinical Lectures in the 26th part of Braithwaite's Retros., p. 278, we give in full.

The treatment of syphilis may be said to be of two kinds, namely, the *simple* and the *mercurial*. The profession are rapidly deciding in favor of the first, although some of its members still give mercury in inveterate cases: many of those we meet with, therefore, have taken the drug, and we have to eradicate the effects of the mineral poison as well as that of the original disease. The simple treatment is divided into internal and external. The diet must be light and mild, so that the hunger should never be quite appeased; the regimen must be more diminished in proportion to the youth and vigor of the patient. Diluent beverages, decoctions of barley, liquorice, and linseed, alone or mixed with milk, should be taken freely. Perfect repose must be observed. Constipation obviated by emollient clysters or mild laxatives. The air should be maintained at the same temperature. Exercise in the convalescent stage, and tepid baths three or four times a day. In the external treatment, strict attention to cleanliness and the position of the diseased parts should never be lost sight of. Emollient fomentations, or dressings of simple cerate, are the best applications. Leeches are generally necessary. We soothe the excessive irritability by the external use of a solution of opium, about two drachms to one ounce of water. When the suppuration is moderated, stimulating dressings, as solutions of the sulphates of alum and copper, the nitrate of silver, &c., will favor cicatrization. In inveterate cases, the iodide of potassium is used with considerable success. The mercurial treatment consists in keeping up slight salivation, by means of the internal administration of blue pills, or some other form of mercury, with mercurial frictions or fumigations, at least for the space of a month. A certain irritability is produced, and the constant soreness of the gums, the metallic taste in the mouth, not to speak of the inconveniences of profuse salivation, which occasionally occurs, render this species of treatment anything but agreeable to the patient. Both kinds of treatment have now been extensively tested. In the year 1822, the Royal Council of Health, in Sweden, having been charged by the king to conduct a series of experiments upon the different modes of treating venereal diseases, reports from all the civil and

ment of which the continuance of the poisonous effects of the remedy for days and weeks together, has been universally considered indispensable to a cure. But quite recently—and Scotland here has taken the lead—it has been demonstrated beyond a doubt by experiment—a synopsis of which Prof. Bennett of Edinburgh has recently published in his *Clinical Lectures*—to the profession and to the world, that this disease is materially aggravated and prolonged by the mercurial course, and the statistics of the simple treatment, that is, without a grain of mercury or any other poison, in contrast with the mercurial treatment of the old school, are a terrible revelation of the poisonous effects of empirical wholesale drugging.

Mercury has been regarded as a specific in this disease by the old school, and justly so; but being ignorant of the law of specifics, by which the organism when diseased is rendered peculiarly susceptible to its homœopathic irritant, they have long poisoned their patients with the drug, and are just beginning to discover their abuse of it; and yet, notwithstanding the eighty thousand cases of the disease which have been submitted to experiment, by means of which Prof. Bennett, of allopathic renown, says,

military hospitals were ordered to be drawn up annually. These reports establish the inconveniences (a very mild term. *Ed.*) of the mercurial system, and the superior advantages of the simple treatment. In the various hospitals of Sweden, 49,000 cases have been under treatment, one-half by the simple method, and the remaining half by mercury; the proportion of relapses have been in the first instance seven and a half, in the second, thirteen and two-thirds, in one hundred. In the Hamburg General Hospital, Dr. Fricke reports that in four years, out of 1649 patients of both sexes, 582 were treated by a mild mercurial course, and 1067 without mercury, the mean duration of the latter was fifty-one days, and that by mercury eighty-five. It was found that relapses were more frequent, and the secondary syphilis more severe, when mercury had been given. When the non-mercurial plan was followed they rarely occurred, and were more simple and mild when met with. He tells us that he has treated more than 5000 patients without mercury, and has still to seek cases in which that remedy may be advantageously employed. He has never observed caries, loss of the hair, or pains in the bones follow his treatment: indeed, in all such cases, which have come under his care, much mercury has been given. His reports were first made public in 1828. In 1833, the French Council of Health published the reports sent in by the physicians and surgeons attached to regiments and military hospitals in various parts of France. Some of the reports are in favor of a mild mercurial course, others in favor of simple treatment. They all agree by stating the cure by mercury to be one-third longer than by the other treatment. In the various reports now published, more than 80,000 cases have been submitted to experiment, by means of which it has been perfectly established that syphilis is cured in a shorter time, and with less probability of inducing secondary syphilis by the simple treatment. These facts being now very generally admitted, malignant syphilis is gradually disappearing. Twenty years ago, the most frightful secondary and tertiary cases were met with, and the usual treatment was profuse salivation. At present such cases are rare, and under the salutary influence of a mild, simple treatment, its virulence is daily abating,

"it is fully established that the disease is cured in a shorter time and with less probability of relapse without mercury"—notwithstanding this fact, the hospital physicians both of England and America, shutting their eyes against this light, are still poisoning their patients by crude doses of this powerful drug. Can we denounce such wilful ignorance and obstinacy in too strong terms? Is it any wonder that skepticism is abroad in a community which is in possession of facts like these? This affords a good illustration of the character of old-school reforms, which never result in the discovery of any principle by which diseases may be cured more successfully, but in ascertaining what remedies in their past treatment have been the most injurious. The latest discovery which the school has made is the fact, that nature, unassisted, will cure diseases even of a violent character. Experiments have already been made in several diseases, and with results highly satisfactory to all lovers of progress. But this is a severe comment on the past history of the profession. It will be sufficient for my present purpose, if I quote the experiments of Dr. Dietl, the physician of a large allopathic hospital in Vienna, of whom Prof. Henderson remarks: "He is not an opponent of the established methods of treatment, and could have had no conceivable purpose of a sinister kind to serve by recording alleged facts, which reflect so injuriously on the practice of that profession of which he avows himself a firm adherent."

Dietl gives 85 cases of pneumonia, treated by blood-letting, of which 16 died, or 20.4 per cent. One hundred and six cases, treated by tart. emetic, of which 22 died, or 20.7 per cent. One hundred and eighty-nine cases he left to follow the natural course of the disease, only requiring a low diet and rest; the result showed only 14 deaths, or 7.4 per cent., revealing the fact, so astonishing to himself, that the plan which has been universally pursued in the old school, and which is still taught as the very best means to be employed in this disease, is about three times more fatal than when left in the hands of nature alone: "an amount of success," says Prof. Henderson, "unapproached in the published experience of any other allopathic physician of any country."

The statistics of the homœopathic treatment of this disease, showing even better results than this, may be disputed; but these facts of Dietl are incontrovertible.

No reflecting mind can escape the convictions which follow such revolutions in practice. And, first, if the adoption of Dr. Todd's method of treatment, by simple fomentations; or that of Dietl, by diet and rest, is an improvement on Dr. Wood's practice, who is at present the representative of the majority of the school: and if

the simple treatment of the surgeons of Scotland is an improvement upon the old mercurial method; then the plan of practice, upon which the school have depended for so many years in these fearful diseases, is an injurious and a fatal one. And, secondly, if the old school have so long maltreated inflammation of the lungs, is it not possible that their treatment of inflammation in other organs may be subject to the same condemnation and subsequent reform?—for it is by no means clear that nature's capacity to cure inflammation stops at the lungs. It is obvious, that it is to this that the old school will at last be compelled to come. These facts and confessions have been given to the world, and the world have a right to use them as such. Can we wonder, since such errors meet the eye at every milestone in the journey of medical progress through two thousand years, and especially since of late years such revolutions result in disarming the physician of his resources one after another, and leaving nature, whose laws and indications have been so grossly misunderstood, more and more undisturbed in working her cure—I say, can we wonder then that skepticism threatens the complete overthrow of the science of healing?

But however we view the statistics of the homoeopathic school, they are conclusive testimony against old-school treatment, if they be regarded as the results of diseases left to nature; and this is the ground that some maintain—or, taking the other horn of the dilemma, and acknowledging the efficacy of the treatment, either view strikingly condemns a system pregnant with so much that is disagreeable and injurious.

To those who have been skeptical observers of the old school—and the number of such is daily increasing—its history presents a dark and melancholy record. Some have watched it through all its changes and revolutions with anxiety and hope, believing that truth would at last be developed out of chaos; and thinking that the profession, bad as it is, was after all better than none.

How great must be the surprise of such, when the nineteenth century reveals the indisputable truth—for facts such as we have recorded admit of no denial—that the experiments, observations, and trials of the old school of medicine, for a period not less than two thousand years, result in the conclusion that unassisted nature is by far the better physician. This it is which I assert distinguishes the old-school reform of the present day from all the changes and revolutions of the past: the fact that the profession are beginning to abandon their principles, and are compelled to sit down with folded hands and see unassisted nature cure diseases more speedily, more safely, and more effectually than the boasted learning of two thousand years. Com-

pelled, I say, because after abandoning the only principles of the school, there is no resort left but in a few specifics which, as we have shown, they are abusing, from ignorance of the law of specifics. That this reform will not stop short of a total abandonment of their present principles of treatment in all forms of disease, and by the school universally, it needs no prophet to foretell.

Already there are thousands within their own ranks, who require no demonstration to prove that the *antipathic* and revulsive principles, their only reliance, are far from being universally applicable; and that when applicable, they are pregnant with serious evils. Their experience has already taught them this; and having given up these principles, they are compelled to trust to the expectant plan, with an occasional resort to the empirical use of specifics.

The adoption of this course by men holding high positions in that school, we regard with the deepest interest and hope. We hail it as the incipient step to the reception of the new system, founded upon a universal law of cure, which, like other primary laws, had its birth with the creation of man, and constitutes the only true basis of medical science;—a law which differs from the principles of the old school, not only in its far more extended application, but also in its entire freedom from the evils which are inseparable from these, they indeed being but the short-lived offspring of shifting theories and speculations as to the nature and causes of disease. It is this condition of the school which renders homoeopathy peculiarly adapted to meet the wants of the age in which we live. The bitter opposition of the old school, at the time when our science was first brought to light, is not a matter of surprise to us. The confidence of the old school in their principles of cure was then unlimited, and it had not been shown by experiment that diseases could be cured without the application of those principles.

The new system was virtually a condemnation of those principles; for instead of attacking the well organs to cure the sick as the plan of treatment of the old school required, the new school, by their law of specifics, adapted the remedy to the organ diseased, leaving the other parts of the organism undisturbed; instead of administering large doses of a remedy, which the old school must do to be successful upon their principles, the new system, by reason of the nice adaptation and homoeopathic applicability of the remedy, professed to be able to cure by the administration of the smallest conceivable dose. Again, instead of pursuing the old plan of ascertaining the action of remedies by administering them in disease, or by poisoning cats and dogs with them, the new system selecting the most healthy

from a large number of persons, had formed a new materia medica by proving her remedies upon them. I say, then, that their opposition is not a matter of surprise to us; for the discovery of nature's ability to cure—constituting the intermediate step between the old school and the new—had not then been made; but now that this discovery has shaken the confidence of the old school in their principles of cure, it seems as if Providence designed, amid the various blessings which have crowned this age, to grant this discovery of a *law of cure*, the greatest of temporal gifts to man, at a time when man was most ready for its reception. And this may be one reason of the rapid spread of homœopathy, so rapid that it has not its parallel in the history of the world; embracing within its circle, which has emanated from its centre scarce half a century, every civilized nation on the globe.

We are now able to offer to the skeptic a beautiful science founded on an unfailling law of nature. Does he reply, "I have no confidence in your theories and speculations. I am weary of this ever-changing method of treatment and disagreement between physicians." We have no theories to offer you; the day of theory and speculation has passed away, and the science we recommend knows no instability, no vacillation, and from the nature of its basis can know none. There can be no disagreement between the disciples of our school, for He who permitted disease to exist, so placed the remedy within our reach, revealing an explicit law for its selection, so that it is impossible to mistake in the adoption of the remedy homœopathic to the case.

Does he still object? "But I fear your poisonous drugs." This too was foreseen by the benevolent Lawgiver; and while the agents to cure disease must necessarily be poisons, He so constituted the law on which they were to be selected, that the best effect should follow even the smallest dose, and that an abuse of the remedy would inevitably aggravate the disease, and defeat the end for which it was given. Does the skeptic still demand "the evidence that ours is the *natural* law, and that it is of *universal* application?"

Let him cast his eye over the landscape spread out to our view. On the right are groves of trees with ever-varying light and shade; before us fields of waving grain, and the rich meadow-land furrowed by gentle streams, while above us float the silver clouds arrayed in all their beauty.

The view delights the eye, but this is not its only end. The trees yield us fruit and the materials for habitations, for fuel, and for the vessels of commerce; from the fields of grain our store-houses are filled, and the clouds ever more drop fatness upon the thirsty earth. Creeping beneath the hedge are tangled vines, and all around are plants

and twigs innumerable, which, while they serve to give variety and completeness to the beauties of nature, must also have some more useful end. In each flower, each leaf, each stem or root, lies pictured some disease.

We pluck some leaves, and scarcely have they touched our lips, ere our pulses start and the fire of fever runs through our veins. Others we test, and our joints and limbs are racked with pain. Others still send the quick chills over our trembling frames. While wondering upon these strange phenomena, we fall in with one skilled in the science of medicine, who informs us that the last plant we have been testing on ourselves has been the grand remedy of the profession for years in a form of disease for which it seemed specific, but how it cured none could tell. And what is more wonderful yet, his description of the disease corresponds exactly with our sufferings from the remedy. Can it be, then, that the hand which permitted, for wise reasons doubtless, diseases in their various forms to prey upon mankind, thus planted in the fields their antidote, their counterpart, and so stamped upon these plants their indications, that we have only to test them to give rise to a group of symptoms similar to the natural disease which they were empowered to cure?

Can it be otherwise, unless we suppose that plants grow upon the earth, whose effects upon the human system are the *fac simile* of all phases of disease, and yet with no useful end?

But again, let the skeptic look within himself; his limbs are strong and vigorous, he is capable of great endurance, for the bloom of health is upon his cheek; yet who can say how often, within the brief space of a year, he has been exposed to disease, from cold, from heat, or from the more subtle causes which steal through the air and select their unsuspecting victims. What has enabled him thus to walk in health amid disease, but that he has a principle within him capable of resisting unhealthy impressions?

Such a principle is the vital force of the physiologists of the present day; a force which controls and governs all the phenomena of the organism, and which is capable of reacting against the depressing agencies of disease. Is it not obvious that any treatment, to be successful, must assist the restorative force, the reaction of vitality against disease? It is equally clear that only those remedies whose pathogenetic effects are similar to those of the disease, can act as assistants of the vital force, exciting it to react with greater vigor and effect. The diseased organ being peculiarly susceptible to the action of its homœopathic irritant, the reaction of the vital force against disease may be secured by an infinitesimal dose of the well-chosen drug.

Remedies applied upon either the *anti-pathic* or *revulsive* principle must be stronger in proportion to the severity of the disease; and the stronger the remedy the more depressing is it to the vital force, upon the reaction of which we must depend for a cure.

It is then the vital principle, susceptible of reaction, which constitutes the basis of a law of cure.

But we do not ask the skeptical to accept our science of healing, because reason and analogy would teach us to look for such a law of cure; nor because, having discovered such a law, both the nature of our remedies and the constitution of man are in harmony with that law; nor because specific cures in the records of the old school, before inexplicable, are clearly the results of our principle; nor finally, because it bears the impress of its divine origin in the mercy and benevolence of its operations; but because the practical working of the law for more than half a century abundantly shows its superiority to any and all other methods of practice.

Within the limits of a discourse, but few satisfactory statistics can be given, nor is this necessary. The results of our success in the great epidemics of cholera, dysentery, and more recently in that terrible scourge of the south, yellow fever, and the reports of our hospitals and dispensaries, have been given to the world.

In view of these facts, it becomes the imperative duty of every practitioner of medicine, who would have a conscience void of offence, to test this new system, not after the manner of Andral and others, who grossly misunderstood the whole spirit of our science, but to test it intelligently at the bed-side, in the worst forms of disease, and even in those which may be ready to be abandoned as fatal, and we will answer for the results of such a test.

To those who have been accustomed to the gross treatment of the old school, there is something attractive and beautiful in the practical application of the law of *similia*, by which the little messengers silently and harmlessly carry the boon of health to the sick. It may be that the interest which still lingers in my own mind around the first cases of cure, witnessed by me under the new law, is in some degree due to the contrast with my former mode of treatment and success; but from whatever cause, I can never forget them, and I feel that no apology is necessary for the introduction of the firstborn of my espousal of the new system, in illustration of the power and efficacy of a single infinitesimal dose under the law of *similia*.

The case was one of chronic laryngitis, of one year's standing, in a lady of scrofulous habit. She had been my patient for six months, and at the time I submitted

her case to the test of Homœopathy, it presented the following aspect. The larynx and trachea were thickened, and extremely tender to the touch, so that all motion of the neck was very painful, her voice was husky, and she was harassed by an incessant stridulous cough, which allowed her no rest at night. Her expectoration was muco-purulent and bloody, and hectic fever had been present for several months, with a pulse of 110 to 120. She had profuse night sweats, and moreover considerable emaciation, with great prostration. The whole case presented the aspect of laryngeal phthisis.

I had treated her for the first three months with all the resources which the old school could command, both local and general, and failed even to palliate her sufferings. I then called in Dr. Thomas Cock, Senior, of New-York, who also attended her with me for three months more; but as she gradually grew worse, he said that the case would certainly prove fatal before the expiration of three months. He then withdrew from the consultation after suggesting a few palliatives to ease her sufferings to the grave. As this was a case of well-defined local disease, not easily influenced by changes in the weather, or by the nervous condition of the patient, my impression was that, on this account, it would afford a thorough test of the new system. Feeling too little acquainted with the system to prescribe myself, Dr. Curtis, of New-York, at my request, kindly consented to visit the case with me; after a careful examination of her symptoms and condition, he remarked that the case was formidable, and the result doubtful, but that Homœopathy offered resources which were worthy of trial. Among them he mentioned Bell. Phos. Ars. Hep. and Sulph.; that although Belladonna would probably make the first best impression, yet, inasmuch as the case was a chronic one, other remedies would probably be needed to complete the cure. He dropped some six or eight pellets of the third dilution of Bell. into a wineglassful of water, and directed that one teaspoonful of it should be given that night, and one the next morning; that if an aggravation of the throat symptoms occurred, I should suspend the remedy.

On my visit the next day, she remarked that she should take no more of *that* medicine, as it increased her sufferings; I told her to stop it, and without a word of encouragement left the house; indeed, I had been told too often by her that she was worse, to feel particularly encouraged by it; however, I called again on the third day from my last visit, when she met me at the door of her room with the astounding declaration, "Why, Doctor, I don't know but that I am cured! On the morning following your last visit, I found my throat better, and from that time it has

been improving steadily, until it really seems as if I were almost well." So astonished was I at this statement—not a little provoked with myself, too, that three or four pellets should have done more in a few hours for my patient, than all my pills, boluses, and plasters for six months—so astonished was I that I sat down beside her, and entered into a careful examination of her symptoms, which resulted in the conviction that her statement was strictly true; the soreness and tenderness of the throat had almost entirely disappeared; her cough was greatly relieved, and all her constitutional symptoms much improved. She asserted that at no time within a year had she been thus relieved.

This improvement continued for ten days steadily, with no more medicine; for a few days after that some of her symptoms were not so favorable, but under the action of two or three of the above-mentioned remedies she improved again, and was discharged entirely cured, about the time that Dr. Cook (looking through the spectacles of the old-school system) had predicted her death.

My patient lived eight or nine years, became the mother of two children, and finally died of another disease.

Without a shade of coloring beyond the truth, such are the literal facts of the case in which I first tested the new law. What a striking illustration it affords of the power of an infinitesimal dose acting under that law. The aggravation which followed—by no means necessary to a cure—proves both the peculiar susceptibility of a diseased organ to its homœopathic remedy, and the specific relation of that remedy to the organ diseased. No remedy other than one which was capable of exciting symptoms similar to the disease, could have produced such an aggravation by such a minute dose. Indeed, it is obvious that the power of the Belladonna to accomplish such marvellous results, was not in the quantity or the strength of the dose, *but in the relation which the drug sustained to the disease, and in the principle of reaction involved in this relation.* This case is moreover an illustration of a *principle* of cure which is of universal application to all forms of disease within the sphere of its curative action. Does the old-school practitioner need further inducement to examine the new system? We would remind him of the fact that of the many thousands who have left his own ranks, and have thoroughly and practically investigated homœopathy, not one can be shown to have become dissatisfied with it, and to have returned to the old practice. Or, if this is not enough, we would point him to our *Materia Medica*, the glory of Homœopathy, where are revealed, if it be studied intelligently, a whole army of specifics, with which he may wage successful war against disease. He

will, with difficulty, recognize his old familiar drugs in their new array. An introduction indeed may be necessary to those he has used for half his life. Here stands a champion of some of the severest forms of prosopalgia, of cœlialgia, of ischiæalgia, as certain a specific for them as quinine is in certain forms of intermittent fever, and yet he will hardly recognize his old friend colocynth, which he has only known as an acrid cleanser of the *primæ viæ*. *Spigelia* too, in addition to its usefulness as a vermifuge, he will discover to be invaluable in acute and chronic diseases of the heart, curing them when not organic, and when organic, palliating many of the most distressing symptoms. But we need not multiply examples. With the two hundred specifics of the new school in his hand, the physician need no longer assert that "six weeks is the best remedy for Rheumatism, or that there is no relief from pain but in poisonous narcotics;" indeed no richer mine of treasures can be discovered than is revealed in the records of the Homœopathic *Materia Medica*. Let the physician but study it well and apply its resources upon the law of similia, and the results will both astonish and delight him.

By the discovery of our law and the experiments of our illustrious leader, we, my brethren, as his followers, have been raised to the highest pinnacle of medical science.

In surveying our wide and rich domains, well may we be proud of our success, of our position and prospects, while we are conscious of our integrity of purpose and singleness of aim. But because the ultimate triumph of truth is sure, the disciples of Homœopathy must not become idle in the field. Their field is the world, and their obligations to labor will not cease while a single spot, however remote, where man has reared his dwelling, is without the benefits of their benignant system. It is but just that we, who have toiled through the heat of summer, should reap the harvest which is now at hand. But let us ever remember that it was because Truth has been our standard that we have so wonderfully succeeded, and that every blow struck at us has been as blows upon burning coals, scattering them, and igniting new points of conflagration.

The present age has been called an age of progress, and justly so; but it is more than that, it is emphatically an age of active benevolence. Associations and individuals are respectively striving to surpass each other in good works, actuated by a true spirit of philanthropy. This spirit it is which has planted churches and schools through our Western wilds, and in our cities has turned the haunts of vice into nurseries of good morals and religion. Our work, my brethren, is directly in harmony with the spirit of the age; our science was conceived in benevolence; it has its present

growth from no other cause; and I believe I but do you justice when I assert that this is the actuating motive of the disciples of the school at the present day. By our doctrine the world is to be emancipated from the thralldom of medical ignorance and superstition. The world, who have so long regarded noise and effect, size of dose and power of remedy as identical, cannot comprehend at once by intuition the silent working of a law by which disease, like a spark, is quenched by a drop. Step by step we must lead it along with patience and perseverance, looking for that day of physical renovation, corresponding with the millennium of the moral world, when mankind, released from the twofold slavery of appetite and poisonous drugs, and armed with a curative principle against all manner of disease, in the exhilaration of health and in the full enjoyment of physical strength and beauty, shall acknowledge the founder and the earlier propagandists of our science among the chief benefactors of the human family.

OUR COLLEGE.

A FEW days ago we visited the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, and heard a lecture from each Professor except one. If we were to express the judgment we formed of the qualifications of the gentlemen who compose the Faculty, it would, we fear, be looked upon by our readers as, what is termed in common parlance, a "puff." We intend no such thing. It is our duty to make known to the advocates of homœopathy, physicians and others, that our college in Philadelphia is rapidly reaching, by the labor and ability of its professors and managers, a position that will command the attention of the public, and the confidence of physicians and students of medicine. It is a wonder to us, that our colleagues should have accomplished so much in so short a time. They have had formidable difficulties to meet, the least of which was the limited knowledge of the people in our system of medicine and the direct opposition of allopathists; but the most unpleasant was, the unnatural disapprobation of certain practitioners in the neighborhood, and of our own school, who, from a want of suitable knowledge of what a Homœopathic College ought to be in this country, made foreign institutions, under the patronage of their respective governments, the standard model. This

error gave rise, for a time, to unhappy feelings, not consistent with harmony. The prosperity, however, of the institution has had the effect to weaken this opposition, so that it is now no longer of influence worthy of notice. The number of students increases annually, and we should judge there are in attendance at the present session one hundred, if not more.

Already some of our most zealous and able practitioners are graduates of this college. These are located in different parts of our country, and their number will increase annually by the flow from the Homœopathic College. The homœopathic school has no means at present it can use for the spread of Homœopathy so effectually as by the agency of our college in Philadelphia.

Homœopathy, as promulgated by Hahnemann, is taught here; mongrelism and its kindred practice, modified Allopathy, whatever name it may assume, receives no countenance. The professors are experts in teaching, and manifest a zeal in their branches which is enthusiastic, and as a consequence, almost imperceptibly to himself, the attention of the student is fixed upon the subjects as they are explained, and he is led to feel the value of his present position, and the importance of the work which is to engage his talents when he shall have received the doctorate. Not a student will leave this college who will not be imbued with the laudable purpose to contribute what he can to remove from the world that torment of the human family—allopathic medication. In view, therefore, of the fact that well-qualified practitioners of our school are wanted in numerous places in our rapidly increasing population; and as thorough, unyielding Hahnemannian homœopaths are the only ones who can increase that demand; and inasmuch as our college in Philadelphia is the only one where the student has the opportunity of learning a true science and art in medicine; or, in other words, pure Homœopathy, so as to distinguish it from the *spurious* and pernicious; it seems to us reasonable, and a positive duty of every member of our school to concentrate his influence upon this point.

The immortal truth in medicine which

has been communicated to us by Hahnemann, should not be used for selfish purposes; but controlled by that pure principle which is the basis of our religion, and actuates the great AUTHOR of truth in all his acts. Every one of us should avoid sectional feelings and motives in our school, for they would be not only unworthy the character we profess before the world, but, under existing circumstances, exceedingly unwise.

We profess to be lovers of truth in medicine. We all believe we have reached immutable laws which constitute the science of medicine, and that a practical application of these principles would mitigate human sufferings, by means that are pleasant, safe, and certain.

We know, also, that comparatively few persons have any knowledge of the means we possess to control diseased action, and prolong human existence; in view, then, of this fact, is it not the duty of us all to do what we can to make an institution like our college in Philadelphia, command an influence that shall fill it at every session with those talented young men of our own and other countries, whose chief object will be to acquire and faithfully practice that system of medicine which has been proved to be safer and more certain than any yet known?

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

On the establishment of a Medical College in the city of New-York, made to the Homœopathic Medical Society of the State of New-York, Feb. 14, 1854.

The committee who were appointed under the following resolution of the last session: "Resolved, that a committee of seven be appointed, whose duty it shall be to nominate a board of trustees, procure a charter, and raise funds for the establishment of a Medical College, in the city of New-York," respectfully report, that as many of the committee as conveniently could attend have held several meetings, and undertook to carry out the intention of the Society. The first thing to be accomplished was to secure the services of gentlemen of influence, to act as a Board of Trustees. This your committee labored to do; and as it was intended to locate the College in the city of New-York, it would be necessary to have most of the

Board residents of that city; but it was found, on inquiry, that nearly all of those most suitable to cooperate with this Society, were already engaged in an effort to establish a Hospital for the treatment of diseases homœopathically; they did not seem willing to add to their labors at the present time, in compliance with the request of your committee. This first step having failed, your committee were unable to proceed further, and they are compelled to disappoint the expectations of the Society for the present.

Your committee then directed their attention to a consideration of the question, What can this Society do under existing circumstances to promote the interest of the Homœopathic School of Medicine? This question is intended not to be narrow and sectional; for the labors of physicians of our school in every part of our country are supposed to be designed to promote the good of all wherever located; and it is further believed, that, at the present time, and infancy of our school, the greatest good can be accomplished by a concentration of the influence, as far as practicable, of each member of the school upon a single College. Believing in the concurrence of the Society in this plain and practical principle of policy under existing circumstances, your committee extended their investigations, and it would seem that, as yet, the people are not sufficiently acquainted with the superiority of the homœopathic practice, to feel that interest in the practice, which they no doubt will in a few more years, and consequently it is doubtful if there is a real demand for more than one college, notwithstanding the calls for physicians of our school in many places in our country; but your committee believe that a single college with an able faculty, can, for a few years to come, supply this demand; and the establishment of another, contiguous to the one already in operation, would be inconsistent with the policy proposed for the adoption of this Society, and would thereby almost naturally beget a measure of rivalry uncalled for, and which might be the cause of weakness to both, which might result in annihilation, or at least affect the usefulness of both. Your committee believe it to be important that this Society, which is intended to embrace every acknowledged member of the homœopathic school in the State, should be careful in all its movements to avoid all sectional feeling, and show by acts that it looks to the welfare of the school in the whole country; and as our colleagues in another State have got the start of us in this State, by the organization of a Medical College, which is designed, and, by a consistent co-operation of all, may be used, to promote the interest of the entire school of homœopathy in our common country.

The Society perceives that reference is here made to the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. This College, as is known to your committee, has had to struggle with many difficulties, but it is triumphing. Its power is just developing. Its influence will soon be felt and acknowledged; but still it can hardly be said to be full grown; but it is growing rapidly, and a concentration of the influence of the whole school of our country upon this point, would, in a short time, develop its usefulness to the public, and place it beyond the reach of rivalry; and when this period arrives, as it assuredly will, then another College in the great city of New-York would be demanded by the public in unmistakable language, and this Society would meet with a hearty co-operation on every side, in the establishment of another Homœopathic College.

Our College in Philadelphia has about one hundred students in attendance, at the session now approaching its close. It can accommodate from two hundred and fifty to three hundred students, which numbers, from the gradual yearly increase from its commencement, will in all likelihood be reached in a few years, when the institution should be looked upon as firmly established, and this fact would show the demand for another.

In conclusion, your committee would suggest and urge another thought in close connection with the subject of this report, which is, that it might redound to the credit of this Society to avoid, at the outset, favoring the encouragement of a multiplication of Homœopathic Colleges, because experience in the allopathic school teaches that this sort of rivalry in a school of medicine diminishes the value of the diploma in the public estimation, and may keep in existence numerous weakly and sickly colleges, located in unsuitable places. And your committee would submit the following resolution.

Resolved, That the further consideration of the subject be postponed.

ALONZO S. BALL, } Committee.
S. R. KIRBY, }

Albany, Feb'y 14th, 1854.

REPORTS OF CASES TO THE HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW-YORK.

A CASE BY A. S. BALL, M.D.

The subject of the following case, an adult of temperate habits and sound constitution, about 24 years of age, was attacked with cholera in 1851, while in California. He was then treated by an allopathic practitioner, with mercury and astringents,

among which were opium and the acetate of lead. He recovered, afflicted by a chronic diarrhœa, which presented the following characteristics:

His stools were thin and somewhat irregular, varying in frequency from three to seven times in twenty-four hours; they were generally unattended by pain during the day, but at night accompanied by flatulence and much rumbling of the bowels; *a sense of weakness in the abdomen followed the motions of the bowels*, which were usually small, and of a yellow color. His appetite continued good, and there seemed to be no diminution of strength or flesh. This condition continued for about three years, palliated by an occasional dose of opium. Astringents of the most powerful kind from the very beginning of the case acted only as cathartics. He had resorted to Hydropathy in its various forms, but without benefit. He became my patient in December, 1853, at which time, examining his case with care, I selected *sulphuric acid* as homœopathic to his case, and gave him two drops of the dilute sulphuric acid to a tumbler of water; dose, a tablespoonful four times a day. At the end of the first week he began to improve, the stools became fused and more consistent; at the expiration of a month, he had but one stool per day, and that perfectly healthy in consistency and color. The remedy was then discontinued, and he has remained to the present time perfectly cured.

TINEA CAPITIS, BY CHARLES A. STEVENS, M.D.,
COXSACKIE, GREEN CO., N. Y.

A child of Mr. B., aged one year, had an eruption on its head and face, which formed thick scabs, and at times an ichorous discharge, which had a very disagreeable odor, and irritated the skin when it touched it. The skin was very much inflamed, and there was general fever, when I was called. I gave the patient *malum* (sweet apple root) in the second potency; three pellets once in eight hours for six days, and three pellets once a day for two weeks, completely relieved the little sufferer.

CASE BY DR. G. BRYANT, ALBANY, N. Y.

On the evening of the 20th October, 1853, I was called to see a boy 8 years of age, who had, as the mother said, been suffering four days with a "bad cold," but his cough and difficulty of breathing had continued steadily to increase, notwithstanding the persevering use of hive syrup, goose oil, &c., &c. He had considerable expectoration of tough, very tenacious mucus, until a few hours before I was called in. I found him with very high fever, true croupy-sounding cough, great difficulty of breathing, painfulness of larynx, and many more symptoms that indicated very clearly the

remedy. I prescribed iodine, 2d dilution, six drops in half a tumbler of water, a teaspoonful every hour, until I should call again. I was very much surprised to find him so much relieved the next morning. I continued the same remedy at longer intervals, and on the third day every trace of the disease had disappeared.

There is a feature in this case I think worthy of notice. This boy had always been an inveterate stammerer; but from that time forth, he could talk as correct and straight-forward as any one up to the time that I saw him last, only a few weeks since.

Did the iodine or the croup cure the stammering?

HERE'S WISDOM!!

"DR. CHARLES A. LEE, in his late Introductory to the Students of Sterling Medical College, Ohio, says a common-sense word about Homœopathy. The following will indicate the conclusions reached after a long argument on the subject:

"It is very evident, however, that people do not become converts to any particular system of Medicine or doctrine of Theology, from the amount of proof that may be adduced in their support, but rather from the peculiar constitution and tendency of their mental organization. A person who is ultra in one thing will be ultra in all; a believer in Homœopathy will be, most likely, a believer in Spirit Rappings and Mesmerism. Six-sevenths of the followers of EMANUEL SWEDENBORG, it is ascertained, are enthusiastic disciples of HAHNEMANN. A mystic in religion will be a mystic in medicine. Evidence has nothing to do in the making of such converts."

A few days ago the above appeared in the *Daily Times* of this city. We have not seen the lecture from which the extract purports to have been taken. Our readers should be informed that one of the editors of the *Times* (Dr. Tuthill) is an allopathist of the deepest dye, and is, we judge by his editorials on medical subjects, incompetent to deal impartially with conflicting medical doctrines. We take it, the conclusions "reached" by Dr. Lee are the gist of his lecture. We will examine these grave "conclusions."

The first period, as any one on a moment's reflection will see, is a sweeping, thoughtless assertion, based upon *fatalism*, which Dr. Lee hereby adopts as his religious belief. On this ground, then, we argue, that Dr. Lee is guilty of a glaring absurdity in

complaining of any one for embracing a "system" of medicine or theology, however erroneous he may look upon it; for, according to the chief principle of his religious belief, as set forth by himself, it cannot be avoided, inasmuch as "the peculiar constitution and tendency of their mental organization" must control every one in his faith in medicine and in religion. The doctrine of *fatalism*, as presented by Dr. Lee, places himself where he places others.

He, Dr. L., being governed by the immutable law of his "peculiar constitution, and tendency of his mental organization," believes and teaches the most complete system of quackery it is possible to conceive of; for Allopathy is loose experience without a law, which necessarily makes it empirical in all its parts.

The Doctor then lays down this rule, quite consistent with his *fatalism*: "A person who is ultra in one thing will be ultra in all." The meaning of the word *ultra* among most readers is indefinite. It is used in debate and in conversation for a stigma on the individual to whom it is applied; or it is sometimes used in a dogmatical sense. Dr. Lee, as we read him, employs the word in these two meanings in combination. A fair illustration is the case of the Quaker, who would not kill nor chastise an offending dog, but he would gratify his feelings by giving him a bad name; and he called him a "mad dog."

It is as proper to say that man is an ultraist who adheres strictly to the civil law in all his movements, as to call him an ultraist who advocates obedience to all the requirements of the moral law. Such men may be regarded by Dr. Lee and Dr. Tuthill as one-sided, or as pushing things to extremes, and should be checked by giving them a bad name; but, we take it, the great mass of mankind are not of their opinion.

The word *ultra* can never be properly applied to those who adopt an established law of nature, and act upon it in all things within its sphere. For example, *similia similibus curantur* is an established law of cure, and no other one is known. Now, to call him an ultraist who is guided by this law in the treatment of diseases is not only

inappropriate, but absurd, and also an attempt by a word to cast a stigma upon him; that is, give him a bad name for his consistency. This rule, then, of Dr. Lee is not only wrong, but shows his mental state to be malicious, unless it can be placed under the head of ignorance. In charity we would place it here. Now, under this rule, Dr. Lee goes on in his ignorance or malice and says: "A believer in Homœopathy will be, most likely, a believer in Spirit Rappings and Mesmerism." We do not see how the one is a sequence of the other. What is it to believe in Homœopathy? A homœopathist believes in three things, which embrace the whole system. 1st. A law of cure—like cures like. 2d. That an exact knowledge of the effects of drugs can only be acquired by trials upon the human system while in health. 3d. That small quantities of the appropriate drugs selected under the law of cure are the most safe and certain to cure diseases. Here are the principles of his faith. They are facts and not theories. Now, we ask Dr. Lee, and Dr. Tuthill of the *Times*, who endorses Dr. Lee, does a sane man require a "peculiar constitution and tendency of his mental organization" to believe these facts, which have been, and can be again, by any one of "common sense," proved by experiments?

We ask, further, What connection can there be in one who believes the above facts, and a belief in "Spirit Rappings and Mesmerism"? Just as much as there is in our faith in Homœopathy, and our belief that Dr. Lee has exceedingly moderate reasoning faculties, is a very unfair controversialist, and has never yet had the first clear idea of the principles which constitute Homœopathy. Whether "six-sevenths of the followers of Swedenborg are disciples of Hahnemann" we do not know, nor does Dr. Lee, his statement to the contrary notwithstanding. As it regards ourselves, we are not acquainted with Swedenborg's writings, never having read more than a half dozen pages. We cannot judge why, if it be true, that particular denomination of Christians are disciples of Hahnemann, unless it is from their superior intelligence and judgment; which, probably, is the fact. But how the belief of these people in Swedenborg, and

at the same time their faith in the doctrines of Hahnemann, makes an argument against Homœopathy, we confess we do not perceive. Our readers may think we occupy too much of our columns in noticing this weak attack on our system of medicine; but it affords us an opportunity of explaining our doctrines, which, as a journalist, it is our duty to do.

If our memory does not deceive us, this is Dr. Lee's second attack on Homœopathy. In the first, he most wickedly misquoted Hahnemann's writings for his base purpose, which we noticed at the time in the columns of this Journal. He failed in his object at that time, as he will in his present effort. Dr. Lee's peculiar "mental organization" unfits him for a controversialist. The quotation at the head of this article, if it were all we know of him, proves the accuracy of this assertion. Dr. Lee should know, as well as Dr. Tuthill of the *Times*, that in this day the people seek for the philosophy of facts, and not for the philosophy of theories.

A FEW FACTS, WHICH HINDER THE PROGRESS OF MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE.

The tendency of the undisciplined mind to generalize from a few facts, or from a single fact even, gives rise to every variety of theories, as may be seen in the literature of the allopathic school. The medical profession yields too much to the authority of a name, which is exceedingly embarrassing to talented, learned, and industrious junior members. If a principle be discovered and established by sufficient proof, the author is entitled to credit for his labor and his discovery; and it is right to honor the one by the adoption of the other. If, however, a physician simply advances opinions involving no known principle, or based upon a false one, and seeks to exert an influence upon his colleagues by the force of his name alone, which may have been acquired by wealth or position, the case is widely different.

We revere the name of Hahnemann, but in doing so, we do not necessarily adopt any of his opinions, but we receive the principles he discovered by his industry and

experiments. Therefore he is entitled to our respect and confidence. So of every one under like circumstances, which is a common practice, but the honor is too often withheld until after the death of the discoverer of a scientific principle.

Another fact, which is in the way of the progress of medical knowledge, is the organization of societies and cliques really for individual professional protection, under the pretence of "advancing medical science," giving rise to medical ethics in the form of laws and penalties, which place the younger members in fear of the influence of the elder ones; and under these circumstances few have the boldness, or, we should say, the moral courage to become independent thinkers and actors in accordance with the dictates of their judgment; for if their thoughts and acts differ from the majority of their associates, full well they know, they are sure to be visited by an influence that might blight their prospects for usefulness and necessary emoluments. Restraint of this sort prevails at this time in the allopathic school, and advocated with unusual zeal by all the journals of that school, which is inconsistent with progress; hence it is that that school has not in hundreds of years made progress in the *cure* of diseases; nor can it, until its societies or cliques as they exist be broken up, and organized so as to leave every mind free to act under its own promptings.

What is a code of medical ethics? It is nothing more than to teach physicians good manners towards one another and towards the sick.

If the code of ethics adopted by the American Medical Association (allopathic) embraced rules only to teach one another how to act as gentlemen, little harm would come of it, although it seems to us not very creditable to that association that such written rules were necessary; but they have made the code step aside from its legitimate work, and virtually threatens any one of its members with severe penalties who dares to investigate medical doctrines not acknowledged by the majority; and for publicly dissenting from the doctrines taught in the allopathic colleges, expulsion and disgrace must be visited upon the apostate

from the faith. It is even urged, whether in the code or not we do not recollect, that each college should require an oath from every graduate that he shall never renounce allopathic doctrines and practice; and it is proposed to stipulate in writing, that whoever does so, renders his *diploma* null and void.

This state of things, naturally enough, leads to *party* feeling and to *party* acts, which are manifested in an unamiable denunciation of all doctrine, without examination, that does not emanate, not only from the party, but from certain leaders of the party. But this is not enough; the doctrine must agree with the notions of a large majority of the party, for if it does not, and especially if it would tend to a different practice than allopathic, a disturbance would ensue that nothing short of the professional death of the renegade could allay.

Although we give a very hazy view of the state of things in the allopathic school, yet the unprejudiced reader can see enough to convince him, that under these circumstances the science and practice of medicine cannot progress. In the nature of things it is impossible. The junior members may see that the organization of their school tends directly to make them play into the hands of the senior members, whose interest it is to be strictly conservative; a very large proportion of whom have nothing in them to command our respect but their age. For it is well known that a man may practice medicine fifty years, and have really no experience, because he never knew how to observe, how to study, nor how to reason: therefore it is that those in the profession, who have nothing to recommend them but gray hairs, are always strict conservatives, and should not be permitted to stand in the way of those who love truth, and have talents, learning, industry, perseverance, and the will to seek truth in medicine, however it may conflict with the preconceived opinions of others.

We believe the period is at hand when the yoke that is so galling to the necks of many in the allopathic school will be thrown off; for this is not the day to circumscribe the mind in its work by conven-

ERROR - PAGING-

tional rules. The day is past when intolerance can be endured. We advocate that the mind should be free in its action, and that it is the duty of the physician to seek by all appropriate means that knowledge which will enable him to mitigate human sufferings by the safest and most certain measures, without any fear or favor of societies, cliques, conventions, colleges or individuals. We advocate that every one should feel his individual responsibility, and should honestly act in full view of it, and feel its force urging him on in the strict line of his duty. In this, there needs be no vindictiveness; in fact, this feeling is quite inconsistent with a true love of truth. The man who is not willing, under existing circumstances, to sacrifice his name, if necessary, for the sake of a true healing art, has too narrow views of his position, and is not well qualified to take part in the war which has but just begun between the only two modes that can be adopted in the treatment of human maladies—allopathic and homœopathic. These, in their nature, are arrayed against one another; they are as directly opposed as truth and error. Which ever is proved true, necessarily proves the other false. If one rises, the other must fall. They cannot unite as separate parts into one system. This fact should never be lost sight of, nor is it necessary to refine and split hairs in investigating which is true. The question must be decided by careful and honest experiments. Do drugs cause symptoms like diseases proper? Are diseases cured by those drugs whose symptoms in the healthy human body are like those of diseases?

Are drugs, when attenuated according to Hahnemann's method, more suitable for the cure of diseases, than in their crude form?

Are the doses of drugs as advised in the allopathic therapeutic works, suitable for the treatment of diseases?

Are the doses advised by Hahnemann capable of influencing the human organism when diseased, when taken under the rules proposed by him?

Now we ask any man of common sense, if answers to these questions require any hair-splitting; or whether they admit of theorizing, or any argumentation. It must

appear to all that they do not. Answers can be obtained by experiment only. If, then, this be so, the contest between Allopathy and Homœopathy needs not last long. The question can be settled in a year, or two years at longest.

Those principles which are essential to Homœopathy cannot be investigated by reasoning; nor does the character of the men who believe them make them more or less true; nor does the religious belief of those who profess faith in Homœopathy change it, or make it more or less worthy of notice, Dr. Charles A. Lee to the contrary notwithstanding. Nor is it, according to this fallacious reasoning physician, any less true, if all even who believe in it also believe in Swedenborg's doctrines or are deluded by "spirit rappings." These things, if they were true, have no more bearing on the question of the truth of Homœopathy, than Dr. Charles A. Lee's pretended discovery that the *patella* of ladies' knees could "rap" and answer questions proves that Allopathy is false. But Dr. Lee is a party-man, always has been one; which narrows the mind and obscures the mental vision. It is in this way we account for the absurdity of which he is guilty, in undertaking to decide a scientific question, which can only be determined by experiment, by attacking the religious belief of its adherents.

O Dr. Lee, Dr. Lee! you are fixed in your purpose to make yourself notorious, although we think you do so at a risk incompatible with prudence. That, however, is none of our business. But it does puzzle us to determine which requires the greatest stretch of faith to believe, that Dr. B. Franklin speaks to us mortals through a pine table, or that a woman can speak to us through her knee-joints; you say the latter is true; and other persons as learned, and, so far as we know, as honest and sane as yourself, say the former is true. All this, we know, has nothing to do with Homœopathy or Allopathy, but it has a good deal to do with Dr. Lee, and shows him to be a man, if his knee-joint "rapping" report be carefully read, who, before he investigates a subject in the proper way, decides beforehand how it shall come out, and he can write just as well before the investigation as afterwards. It is the dogmatic spirit of such as Dr. Lee which leads the allopathic school in this country; and it is such who make rules for the government of the members of that school; and in this way they endeavor to exalt themselves to positions they are not fit to occupy. Such men seek their own selfish purposes, and the love of truth never warms their hearts.